

Appl. No. 10/663,963  
Amdt. dated 12/12/2005  
Reply to Office Action of 9/27/2005

---

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Non-Final Office Action dated September 27, 2005. By way of this amendment, claims 16, 17, 22, 25, and 27 have been cancelled. Claims 14, 18, and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-15, 18-21, 23-24, and 26 are currently pending in the application. Further review is requested in light of the following remarks.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 1-13 are allowed.

Claims 14 and 18 have been objected to because of informalities. Particularly, the term "boarders" in claim 14 and 18 should be "borders." Accordingly, claims 14 and 18 have been amended to correct the error.

Claim 27 has been objected to because the language between the preamble and portions of the body of the claim is inconsistent. Claim 27 has been cancelled, thus, the objection is moot.

Claims 14-16, 18-21, 23, 24, 26, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pearce (6,612,060). These rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the present amendment.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 17, 22, and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, independent claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of

Appl. No. 10/663,963  
Amdt. dated 12/07/2005  
Reply to Office Action of 9/27/2005

---

claim 17, independent claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 22, and independent claim 23 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 25. The Examiner has indicated that these combinations include allowable subject matter.

Claim 14 now recites that the frame includes "an outermost periphery of the frame and a surface which defines a recess of the recesses intersect at an outer circumferential edge of the frame, the outer circumferential edge is contiguous with the recess, and the outer circumferential edge and the rear surface are not in a common plane."

Claim 18 now recites that "a first sidepiece of the plurality of sidepieces includes at least one of the recesses which extends between and to ends of the first sidepiece." Claim 23 now recites that the ends of the sidepieces are respectively joined to one another at joints "by fasteners which respectively extend into the sidepieces" to form a frame, and that the "the fasteners are visible at the rearmost surface of the frame." Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 depends from independent claim 14, and is thus believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above.

Claim 16 has been cancelled, thus, the rejection is moot.

Claims 19-21 depend from independent claim 18, and are thus believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above.


Claims 24 and 26 depend from independent claim 23, and are thus believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above.

Claim 27 has been cancelled, thus, the rejection is moot.

Appl. No. 10/663,963  
Amdt. dated 12/12/2005  
Reply to Office Action of 9/27/2005

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance.  
Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-15, 18-21, 23-24,  
and 26 at an early date is solicited.


Respectfully submitted,



Brandon C. Trego  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 53,702

Brandon C. Trego  
ADAMS EVANS P.A.  
2180 Two Wachovia Center  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28282  
Tel. 704-375-9249  
Fax: 704-375-0729  
e-mail: [bct@adamsnat.com](mailto:bct@adamsnat.com)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile  
transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office  
to Fax No. (571) 273-8300 December 12, 2005.

  
Myra P. Howell

12/12/05  
Date of Signature